ESP sales in the preliminary results. The Department analyzed ESP transactions with entry dates that fell within the period of review (POR). Du Pont argues that the Department's established policy is to analyze ESP sales by date of sale rather than date of entry, because ESP sales frequently enter the United States prior to the actual date of sale. Du Pont argues that the Department should revise its calculations to analyze ESP sales by sale date instead of entry date.

Daikin agrees that the Department's calculations should be revised in order to capture all ESP transactions with sale dates during the POR.

DOC Position: We agree. We erroneously analyzed ESP sales by entry date rather than sale date, as is our established practice. We have revised the calculations for these final results.

Issue Raised by Daikin

Comment 3: Daikin argues that the Department should reduce the quantity sold on U.S. sales by the quantity of returned merchandise in order to account for losses incurred by Daikin for the replacement of defective merchandise, which, Daikin stated, cannot be resold. Daikin notes that, according to the Department's analysis memorandum, the Department intended to adjust the quantity sold by the quantity of returned merchandise.

Antidumping Duty Order on Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin from Japan—Analysis Memorandum for Preliminary Results of Second Review of Daikin Industries (December 2, 1994) (Analysis Memorandum).

Daikin states that such an adjustment is necessary in order to avoid double counting the costs and expenses associated with returned merchandise, because all expenses related to returns are reported under separate variables and are already incorporated in the margin calculation. According to Daikin, failure to make the adjustment would result in the same merchandise contributing a second time to an increase in dumping duties when the Department calculates duties for the returned quantity. Furthermore, Daikin argues that the Department routinely adjusts for returns by deducting the amount returned from the original

DOC Position: We agree with Daikin. We intended to adjust the quantity of U.S. sales by deducting the quantity of returned defective merchandise. Analysis Memorandum at 2. The returned merchandise can be tied to the related sale by invoice number. We made a similar adjustment for returns associated with home market sales. We

have revised our calculations for these final results to adjust U.S. sales quantities to account for returns.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of the comments received, we have revised our preliminary results and determine that the following margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (per- cent)
Daikin Industries	08/01/92– 07/31/93.	23.33

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between United States price and foreign market value may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act:

(1) The cash deposit rate for Daikin will be the rate shown above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less-than-fairvalue (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will be 91.74 percent, the "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation, for the reasons explained in PTFE I

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOS) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d)(1). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: June 21, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 95–15610 Filed 6–26–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

Beckman Research Institute et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as each is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

Docket Number: 95–001. Applicant: Beckman Research Institute of the City of Hope, Duarte, CA 91010. Instrument: Mass Spectrometer, Model MAT 900. Manufacturer: Finnigan MAT, Germany. Intended Use: See notice at 60 FR 5166, January 26, 1995. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) capability of switching modes between scans based on results of the previous scan, (2) magnetic sector operations and (3) high sensitivity with electrospray. Advice Received From: National Institutes of Health, April 25, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–002. Applicant: Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, La Verne, CA 91750. Instrument: Mass Spectrometer, Model Autospec. Manufacturer: Fisons, United Kingdom. Intended Use: See notice at 60 FR 7168, February 7, 1995. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides

magnetic sector design permitting both high and low energy MS/MS with resolution to 60 000 and accuracy to ± 0.002 dalton to eliminate chemical interferences. *Advice Received From:* National Institutes of Health, April 25, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–006. Applicant:
Northwestern University, Evanston, IL
60208-2150. Instrument: Mass
Spectrometer, Model OPTIMA.
Manufacturer: Fisons Instruments,
United Kingdom. Intended Use: See
notice at 60 FR 9662, February 21, 1995.
Reasons: The foreign instrument
provides: (1) on-line and dualmicroinlet sample preparation and (2)
high accuracy, high precision
simultaneous multi-isotope
measurements of gaseous species.
Advice Received From: National
Institutes of Health, April 25, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–009. Applicant: University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712. Instrument: Precise Range and Range-rate Equipment Satellite Tracking Ground Station. Manufacturer: Dornier GmbH, Germany. Intended Use: See notice at 60 FR 13700, March 14, 1995. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) a regenerative, coherent Xband transponder for precise range and range rate measurements and (2) an Sband receiver for measurement of S/Xband delay difference to permit operation as a ground station for the ERS-2 satellite. Advice Received From: The Satellite Research Lab, NOAA, April 25, 1995.

The National Institutes of Health and The Satellite Research Lab advise that (1) the capabilities of each of the foreign instruments described above are pertinent to each applicant's intended purpose and (2) they know of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value for the intended use of each instrument.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus being manufactured in the United States which is of equivalent scientific value to any of the foreign instruments.

Frank W. Creel

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff [FR Doc. 95–15611 Filed 6–26–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–DS–F

Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

Pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651; 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301), we invite comments on the question of whether instruments of equivalent scientific value, for the

purposes for which the instruments shown below are intended to be used, are being manufactured in the United States.

Comments must comply with 15 CFR 301.5(a)(3) and (4) of the regulations and be filed within 20 days with the Statutory Import Programs Staff, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230. Applications may be examined between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 94–145R. Applicant: Miami University, Office of Purchasing, 213 Roudebush Hall, Oxford, OH 45056. Instrument: Cryostage. Manufacturer: Linkham Scientific Instruments, Ltd., United Kingdom. Intended Use: Original notice of this resubmitted application was published in the FEDERAL PECISTER of Innum 4, 1995.

REGISTER of January 4, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–043. Applicant:
Indiana University Medical Center,
Department of Radiation Oncology, 535
Barnhill Drive, Indianapolis, IN 46202-5289. Instrument: Radiation Therapy
Simulator, Model Simulix-MC.

Manufacturer: Oldelft, The Netherlands.
Intended Use: The instrument will be used for training resident radiation oncologists and student radiation therapists in the use and operation of this equipment. Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs: June 2, 1995.

Docket Number: 95-044. Applicant: The University of Iowa, Department of Chemical and Biochemical Engineering, Iowa City, IA 52242. Instrument: Laser Light Scattering Correlator and Monomode Fiber Optical Goniometer System. Manufacturer: AL - Laser Vertriebsgesellschaft mbH, Germany. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used to study polyphenolics, polycarbohydrates, proteins, surfactants of varying types, and whole cells (yeast, bacteria and insect cells). The experiments will consist of measurements of polymer characteristics (mass, size, force) to confirm or assess the state of purity of commercially purchased samples or samples prepared in the labs which are used as standards during other tests. The instrument will also be used extensively in Ph.D. Dissertation coursework by students operating the instrument collecting and analyzing the data, and characterizing the various samples. Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs: June 2, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–045. Applicant: The Scripps Research Institute, 10666 N. Torrey Pines Road, La Jolla, CA 92037. Instrument: Mass Spectrometer System, Model API 100. Manufacturer: PE Sciex, Canada. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used to conduct studies of proteins, peptides, oligonucleotides and carbohydrates, natural and synthetic products and components of biological fluids. The goal of the investigations is to further develop electrospray mass spectrometry as a tool for biological and biochemical research. *Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs:* June 5, 1995.

Docket Number: 95–047. Applicant: Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303. Instrument: Laser Ablation System, Model 266. Manufacturer: Finnigan MAT, United Kingdom. *Intended Use:* The instrument will be used in a pilot study to determine trace elements, including rare earth elements in fluid inclusions. The goals of this study are to: (1) fully develop the crush-leach ICPMS for analyzing bulk inclusions for REE and other petrologically and economically important trace metals, (2) evaluate the full potential of LA-ICPMS for the study of single fluid inclusions, and (3) conduct a detailed ICPMS study on bulk fluid inclusions and LA-ICPMS study on single fluid inclusions from the Bingham, base metal porphyry system in order to determine which fluids carried the bulk of the metals in this system. Application Accepted by Commissioner of Customs: June 6, 1995.

Frank W. Creel

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff [FR Doc. 95–15612 Filed 6–26–95; 8:45 am]

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Air Force

Intent to Grant an Exclusive Patent License

Pursuant to the provisions of Part 404 of Title 37, Code of Federal Regulations, which implements Public Law 96–517, the Department of the Air Force announces its intention to grant Diffracto Limited, a corporation of the Province of Ontario, Canada, an exclusive license under: U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 08/415,407 for a "System And Method For Measuring Crazing In A Transparency".

The license described above will be granted unless an objection thereto, together with a request for an opportunity to be heard, if desired, is received in writing by the addressee set forth below within sixty (60) days from the date of publication of this Notice. Copies of the patent application may be